

should be filed on or before February 24, 1995. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection in the Public Reference Room.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-4353 Filed 2-22-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. RP95-163-000]

**CNG Transmission Corporation
Complainant v. Tennessee Gas
Pipeline Company Respondent; Notice
of Complaint**

February 16, 1995.

Take notice that on February 13, 1995, CNG Transmission Corporation (CNG) filed a complaint against Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (Tennessee).

CNG states that by letter dated and faxed October 5, 1994, Tennessee notified CNG that effective for gas flow at 7:00 a.m. CST, on October 6, 1994, that Tennessee would no longer accept nominations on CNG's Service Package #3919 for delivery to non-CNG delivery points (i.e., secondary delivery points) in Tennessee's Zone 4 and/or 5, unless CNG agreed in writing to pay Tennessee's maximum applicable rates for secondary point deliveries into Tennessee's Zone 4 and/or Zone 5.

CNG states that in CNG's Order No. 636 restructuring proceeding, parties, including Tennessee, entered into a settlement agreement, filed March 31, 1993, and accepted by the Commission by orders issued July 16, September 17, and December 16, 1993, in Docket No. RS92-14-000, *et al.* As part of the Restructuring Settlement, CNG agreed to assign to its firm customers the portion of CNG's pre-existing capacity on Tennessee from the production area to a pooling point located in Tennessee's Zone 3; CNG retained control of the firm capacity on Tennessee from that same pooling point in Zone 3 downstream to Tennessee's Zones 4 and 5. The Restructuring settlement expressly provided that CNG retained the downstream portion of its pre-existing capacity on Tennessee to enable CNG to facilitate dispatching and no-notice deliveries to CNG's customers.

CNG states that in a meeting held in Washington, D.C., on November 7, 1994, CNG and Tennessee requested the Commission's Enforcement Task Force to provide an informal opinion regarding the immediate dispute. The

Enforcement Task Force affirms CNG's position that the language of the Restructuring settlement gives CNG a contractual guarantee of the incremental rate for service to all of CNG delivery points (both primary and secondary) in Zones 4 and 5. As the explicit language of the settlement states, the incremental reservation charge is established as the maximum reservation charge for all service from Zone 3 to Zone 4 or Zone 5, whether CNG uses primary or secondary delivery points.

CNG states that Tennessee has rejected the informal opinion of the Enforcement Task Force, and subsequent efforts by CNG and Tennessee to negotiate a settlement of the dispute have failed.

Comments by Tennessee on the complaint, as well as motions to intervene or protests should be filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, on or before February 27, 1995. CNG or any other party that wants to file reply comments must file those reply comments on or before March 6, 1995. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this complaint are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-4355 Filed 2-22-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. RP95-161-000]

**Northern Natural Gas Company; Notice
of Proposed Changes in FERC Gas
Tariff**

February 16, 1995.

Take notice that on February 13, 1995, Northern Natural Gas Company (Northern), tendered for filing to become part of Northern's FERC Gas Tariff, Fifth Revised Volume No. 1, the following tariff sheet, proposed to be effective March 15, 1995:

First Revised Sheet No. 215

Northern states that its filing is to revise Section 7, "Liability of Parties", of the General Terms and Conditions of its Tariff.

Northern further states that copies of the filing have been mailed to each of its customers and interested State Commissions.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a petition

to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with rules 214 and 211 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214 and 385.211). All such petitions or protests must be filed on or before February 24, 1995. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-4356 Filed 2-22-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. RP95-160-000]

**Texas Gas Transmission Corporation;
Notice of Proposed Changes in FERC
Gas Tariff**

February 16, 1995.

Take notice that on February 13, 1995, Texas Gas Transmission Corporation (Texas Gas) tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Original Volume No. 1, the following revised tariff sheet, with an effective date of March 15, 1995:

Second Revised First Revised Sheet No. 230

Texas Gas herein modifies Section 33.3(f) of its General Terms and Conditions in order to clarify the original intent of this provision, while complying with the Commission's interpretation and rulings as stated in its January 27, 1995, Order.

Texas Gas states that copies of the revised tariff sheets are being mailed to Texas Gas's jurisdictional customers and interested state commissions.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with §§ 385.211 and 385.214 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such motions or protests should be filed on or before February 24, 1995. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are

available for public inspection in the Public Reference Room.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-4357 Filed 2-22-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

Office of Hearings and Appeals

Notice of Issuance of Decisions and Orders During the Week of December 12 Through December 16, 1994

During the week of December 12 through December 16, 1994, the decisions and orders summarized below were issued with respect to applications for other relief filed with the Office of Hearings and Appeals of the Department of Energy. The following summary also contains a list of submissions that were dismissed by the Office of Hearings and Appeals.

Request for Exception

Olympic Oil Co., Inc., 12/14/94, LEE-0160

Olympic Oil Co., Inc. (Olympic) filed an Application for Exception from the Energy Information Administration (EIA) requirement that it file Form EIA-782B, the "Resellers'/Retailers' Monthly Petroleum Product Sales Report." Olympic claimed that it should be relieved of the requirement because it had been filing the form since January 1993 and because the task took the firm's limited office staff over four hours to complete each month. In considering this request, the DOE found that Olympic was not suffering gross

inequity or serious hardship.

Accordingly, on October 24, 1994, the DOE issued a Proposed Decision and Order determining that the exception request should be denied. Neither Olympic nor any other party filed an Objection to that Proposed Decision and Order, so the DOE issued it in final form.

Refund Applications

Garrison Fuel Oil of L.I., Inc., 12/12/94, RF272-92317

The DOE issued a Decision and Order concerning the Application for Refund of a claimant in the Subpart V crude oil overcharge refund proceeding. The DOE determined that the applicant resold the refined petroleum products that formed the basis of its application and thus passed on the costs of any overcharges to its customers. The DOE concluded that the claimant had not shown that it was injured by any of the overcharges associated with the gallons that it purchased. Accordingly, the DOE denied the Application for Refund.

Texaco Inc./D & B Texaco, 12/14/94, RF321-20008, RF321-2009

Donald Maile requested refunds based on purchases of Texaco products made by two service stations that he operated. Mr. Maile's estimates of the outlets' purchases were based only on his memory of his businesses, and the DOE relied instead on information obtained from Texaco; in one case, the purchase volume provided by Texaco was much lower than Mr. Maile's estimate. In addition, the evidence submitted strongly suggested that Mr. Maile's

businesses were operated as partnerships. Accordingly, the DOE issued a Decision granting Mr. Maile one-half of the refund due to each station.

Texaco Inc./H&R Texaco Station, 12/13/94, RR321-168

The DOE issued a Decision and Order concerning a Motion for Reconsideration filed by Howell and Richard Sumrall in the Texaco Inc. special refund proceeding on behalf of H&R Texaco Station (H&R), a reseller located in Evansville, Indiana. A refund previously had been granted for purchases made by the station from 1972 through January 1977. However, it came to the attention of the DOE that this refund was incorrectly based on a time period during which the Sumralls did not operate the station. In the Motion, the Sumralls satisfactorily documented the time period during which they operated the station and established that the correct refund amount was in excess of the previously received refund amount. The total amount of the additional refund granted to the Sumralls in this Decision was \$579 (\$404 principal plus \$175 interest).

Refund Applications

The Office of Hearings and Appeals issued the following Decisions and Orders concerning refund applications, which are not summarized. Copies of the full texts of the Decisions and Orders are available in the Public Reference Room of the Office of Hearings and Appeals.

Atlantic Richfield Company/Lowell O. Volden	RF304-13926	12/12/94
Atlantic Richfield Company/Rice Brothers Service	RF304-15451	12/13/94
Avis Rent A Car	RF272-93539	12/14/94
Bellmawr Borough School Dist. et al	RF272-79811	12/13/94
Bjorklund Trucking Inc	RC272-276	12/15/94
Blackwell Cooperative Elevator Association et al	RF272-94767	12/13/94
Chatham County Board of Education et al	RF272-94931	12/14/94
Enron Corp./Jayson's Bottle Gas	RF340-111	12/12/94
Frankston Reliance Gas Co., Inc	RF340-121	
Gulf Oil Corporation/Leo J. Ketchell, Inc	RF300-14544	12/14/94
Hefley Trucking Co. et al	RF272-84988	12/13/94
Kentucky Transfer Line, Inc., et al	RF272-96127	12/14/94
Texaco Inc./Charles H. Fortinberry et al	RF321-6754	12/15/94
Texaco Inc./Crestwood Service et al	RF321-19335	12/15/94
Texaco Inc./Gold Beach Texaco et al	RF321-20269	12/15/94
Texaco Inc./Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company et al	RF321-20607	12/13/94
Texaco Inc./National Steel Corporation et al	RF321-20800	12/15/94
Texaco Inc./Tipton's Service Station et al	RF321-12779	12/13/94
Union Camp Corporation	RF272-95151	12/14/94
Union Camp Corporation	RF272-95162	

Dismissals

The following submissions were dismissed:

Name	Case No.
A.R. Fuels, Inc	RF321-20370
Alaska Aerofuel, Inc	LEE-0129
American Synthetic Rubber Corporation	RF321-20788